United Nations A/HRC/33/45

General Assembly

Distr.: General
20 July 2016

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Thirty-third session
Agenda item 3
Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Report of the Working Group on the Right to Development on its seventeenth session (Geneva, 25 April – 3 May 2016)

Chair-Rapporteur: Zamir Akram (Pakistan)

GE.16-12543(E)

1612543

Please recycle

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Organization of the session	3
III.	Summary of proceedings	4
	A. General statements	4
	B. Informal consultations by the Chair-Rapporteur	8
	C. Report of the High Commissioner on the realization and implementation of the right to development	9
	D. Interactive dialogue on the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda in the context of the right to development	10
	E. Second reading to refine the draft right to development criteria and corresponding operational sub-criteria	14
	F. Consideration of the report of the Chair-Rapporteur	15
IV.	Conclusions and recommendations	18
	A. Conclusions	19
	B. Recommendations	19
Annex		
	List of attendance	21

I. Introduction

1. The Working Group on the Right to Development was established pursuant to Commission on Human Rights resolution 1998/72, with a mandate to monitor and review progress made in the promotion and implementation of the right to development, as elaborated in the Declaration on the Right to Development, at the national and international levels, providing recommendations thereon and further analysing obstacles to its full enjoyment, focusing each year on specific commitments in the Declaration; to review reports and any other information submitted by States, United Nations agencies, other relevant international organizations and non-governmental organizations on the relationship between their activities and the right to development; and to present for the consideration of the Commission a sessional report on the deliberations of the Working Group, including advice to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) on the implementation of the right to development and suggesting possible programmes of technical assistance at the request of interested countries, with the aim of promoting the implementation of the right to development.

2. In its resolution 30/28, the Human Rights Council decided to convene a two-day formal meeting of the Working Group, after the seventeenth session, to consider the report of the Chair-Rapporteur containing standards for the implementation of the right to development (A/HRC/WG.2/17/2).

3. The Working Group convened its seventeenth session in Geneva from 25 April to 3 May 2016.

II. Organization of the session

4. In her opening statement,[1] the Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights noted that, although the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development was overshadowed by many crises facing the world, there were also signs of hope. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement on climate change gave new impetus to the realization of the right to development, for which the international community had to be made accountable. Despite record economic growth, millions of people had been left behind or left out. The progress made towards the realization of the right to development was uneven. Persistent poverty and deepening inequalities were major threats to development, human rights and peace and security. Violence – in the Syrian Arab Republic, Iraq, Burundi, Ukraine and Yemen – was destroying the hard won gains of development, killing hundreds of thousands of people and forcibly displacing millions from their homes. This was an issue that also fell within the reach of the right to development, a right that offered much-needed prevention: it could address root causes, and help to meet structural challenges at all levels, including at the international level, where some of those challenges originated. The year 2016 was a special one, as the international community celebrated both the thirtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Development and the fiftieth anniversary of the International Covenants on Human Rights. The Declaration was a milestone in reuniting the rights contained in the two covenants, in underlining the universality, indivisibility, interdependence and interrelatedness of all human rights. Central to the right to development was also the full realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, a

[1] The full text of the statement is available from www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Development/Pages/17thSession.aspx.

right that figured prominently as the first article in both covenants. Like the Declaration itself, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development determined "to leave no one behind" starting with those "furthest behind". The international community pledged to ensure that the sustainable development goals and targets were met "for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society". The 2030 Agenda should not be stunted by indifferent action, malnourished by failed commitments or denied safe passage to its fullest realization just because of the inconvenience of what undoubtedly were its tough but necessary demands.

5. At its first meeting, on 25 April 2016, the Working Group re-elected by acclamation Zamir Akram (Pakistan) as Chair-Rapporteur. In his opening statement, the Chair-Rapporteur assured the Working Group of his dedication and commitment to make every effort to ensure that the Working Group continued to make progress in the fulfilment of its mandate. He was particularly honoured by the Working Group's confidence in entrusting him the task of drafting standards for the implementation of the right to development. He was confident that the Working Group would again make good progress in the current year. He was determined to move forward under the Working Group's collective guidance, in a constructive spirit and with a focus on common ground. The thirtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Development and the commencement of the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals provided hope, and reminded all of their collective responsibility to deliver on the promise of a better life for the millions of people around the world who lacked access to basic goods and whose most basic needs were not being met. The Chair-Rapporteur referred to information that highlighted some of the obstacles to the realization of the right to development, but that also gave reason for hope. The adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals had resolved the controversies over the right to development, constituting a comprehensive framework for development that was accepted universally. The 17 goals included all the crucial elements of the right to development, such as ending poverty and hunger, ensuring healthy lives, inclusive and equitable education, achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women, and promoting inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all. Of particular importance was Goal 17 concerning the means of implementation and the global partnership for sustainable development, which should be read together with the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

6. The Working Group subsequently adopted its agenda (A/HRC/WG.2/17/1) and programme of work.

7. During the session (see annex for the list of attendance), the Working Group considered the consolidated report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the realization and implementation of the right to development (A/HRC/30/22), engaged in an interactive dialogue on the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda in the context of the right to development, continued the second reading of the draft right to development criteria and corresponding operational sub-criteria, and considered the report of the Chair-Rapporteur containing standards for the implementation of the right to development (A/HRC/WG.2/17/2).

III. Summary of proceedings

A. General statements

8. Speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed the view that the realization of the right to development was more necessary than ever. Three decades had passed since the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Development; on the eve of its thirtieth anniversary, the international community had to

show its solidarity to achieve common goals, including those in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The right to development was central to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, to which the international community should pay particular attention. All human rights were interrelated and interdependent. At the same time, the realization of the right to development faced many challenges and obstacles, including the political impasse within the Working Group. While States had the primary responsibility to ensure development and favourable conditions, and the duty to take steps to achieve the full realization of the right to development, appropriate means were required to foster comprehensive development and international cooperation. The Movement noted that the ongoing review of the draft right to development criteria and operational sub-criteria should move towards a legally binding instrument to make the right to development a reality for all.

9. The European Union strongly supported sustainable development and eradicating poverty. To achieve these goals, gender equality, accountability, equitable globalization and good governance were required. Development strategies should treat individuals as central, and realize civil and political rights, as well as economic, social and cultural rights. This would entail a mix of policies, although any development policy should make the individual the main participant. States should act individually and collectively to realize the right to development so that individuals also realized their right to development. It hoped that time would be used well during the session to move the Group's discussions tangibly forward, including the discussions on the report of the Chair-Rapporteur, in order to reach a positive and consensual outcome. This would mean going beyond politics and focusing on the things that united the international community rather than those that divided it.

10. Speaking on behalf of the African Group and aligning itself with the Non-Aligned Movement, South Africa stated that, since the World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna in 1993, the recognition of the right to development could no longer be in doubt. Article 22 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights was testimony to the transcendence of the right beyond the realm of soft international human rights law. The principles of the right to development were a central requirement in the continental economic and social renewal and development paradigm of the New Partnership for Africa's Development. One of the most persistent accountability deficits had, however, been at the international level in relation to the commitments to the global partnership for development. A strengthened and revitalized Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, as envisaged under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, was thus crucial. These points on accountability should be framed by the principles of the right to development as enshrined in the Declaration on the Right to Development. Furthermore, the phenomenon of globalization and its negative impact on the economies of developing countries had brought about disparities in the equitable sharing of the benefits of globalization. The Group of African States emphasized that issues such as trade and trade liberalisation, transfer of technology, infrastructure development and market access had to be managed effectively in order to mitigate the challenges of poverty and underdevelopment, to realize the Millennium Development Goals still to be reached, and to make the right to development and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development a reality for everyone. As the international community commemorated the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development, it was time to move forward with a sense of urgency. Indeed, the timely adoption of the 2030 Agenda offered the international community the opportunity to recommit itself. The convening of a high-level segment at the seventy-first session of General Assembly on the right to development would mark a milestone. The 2030 Agenda was explicit about what was required for the realization of the right to development in the areas of education and health, and with regard to finance, technology development and transfer and other support. There was an urgent need for the

United Nations human rights machinery to ensure the operationalization of the right to development as a priority issue by the drafting of a convention on the right to development.

11. Egypt stated that development should address those in more need, and reaffirmed the need to eliminate all forms of poverty. International cooperation should be aimed at providing a sound and equitable environment. The three dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental – should be addressed. The transfer of technology, finance and other priorities also needed to be addressed. There was a need to reform the international financial and trade order to achieve the right to development. Egypt also stated that the right to development was at the heart of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

12. Sri Lanka, aligning itself with the statement by the Non-Aligned Movement, reiterated the main principle of the right to development. The indivisible, interdependent and interconnected nature of human rights meant that the realization of the right to development was critical to achieving all human rights. There had to be a commitment to refine the draft right to development criteria and operational sub-criteria to advance towards an international legally binding instrument on the right to development that would contribute to an enabling international environment for sustainable development. Extreme poverty, climate change and financial crises should be addressed. No one should be left behind. Most of the Sustainable Development Goals were aimed at satisfying the most basic needs. Furthermore, international cooperation, the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development and other issues had to be addressed. The efficiency of the Working Group was a key factor. It should refocus on achieving the right to development as a human right and central to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

13. India referred to the right to development as a neglected aspect of human rights. It concurred that, with the thirtieth anniversary and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, there was fresh vigour for an idea that had fallen off the global radar. Lasting progress would depend not only on national policies but also on an enabling international environment for development, given the historical injustices endured and the state of undemocratic global governance. These calls had gone unanswered. More needed to be done to advance towards the final destination; hard-won gains should not be wasted, and work should be focused on attaining Sustainable Development Goal 17 and the mainstreaming of the right to development in the activities of United Nations agencies, funds and programmes. Political will and genuine commitment were required to make the right to development a reality; the standards proposed by the Chair-Rapporteur would be a good starting point.

14. Brazil noted that the world had made considerable achievements in recent decades. Progress had, however, been uneven, and too many were still being left behind. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development gave new impetus to the efforts of the international community to realize the right to development. The 2030 Agenda also placed people squarely at the centre of development. Sustainable Development Goal 17 provided new momentum to realize the right to development. The Working Group needed to conclude its unfinished business and move forward in its work, especially in the context of the 2030 Agenda. Brazil appreciated the draft set of standards of the Chair-Rapporteur and the report of the High Commissioner. The Working Group should focus on the objectives of its mandate, as stated by the Commission on Human Rights in its resolution 1998/72. Regardless of the differences and disputes of the past, it encouraged all Member States to move ahead.

15. China pointed out that the right to development was an inalienable human right, a common aspiration of all humanity and its shared values. Although it had a powerful impact on world peace and prosperity, there were impediments to its achievement. These included an international political and economic order that was inequitable and unjust.

Military interventions could provoke instability and sometimes result in increased poverty and extremism. These actions undermined the very foundations and livelihoods of developing countries. In addition, some developed countries refused to regard the right to development as a human right, therefore undermining the work of the Working Group. The obligation resided with Governments to ensure the implementation of this right and to observe the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular sovereignty, equality and diversity among countries, and the rights of States to their own social systems and paths to development. The international community had to create a new international order that was equitable and just, where all countries participated equally and enjoyed equal opportunities to benefit from development. On the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration and shortly after the adoption of the 2030 agenda, China had called upon all countries to show good will and commitment to give the right to development its proper status as a human right and to allow the Working Group to move forward in its mandate. OHCHR should promote the right to development as a priority and demonstrate its leadership in the United Nations for the implementation of the right.

16. Pakistan, aligning itself with the statement of the Non-Aligned Movement, stated that the right to development was a human right and a link between national and international priorities. Countries could not be selective with regard to partnership. While realizing the goals of the 2030 Agenda, in particular Goal 17, they should focus on issues such as the resolution of international disputes, which was central to the Declaration on the Right to Development. There should also be a focus on access to markets, affordable medicines and education, among others. OHCHR should ensure that the right to development had a specific space in its structure and did not disappear in the context of mainstreaming.

17. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, aligning itself with the statement made by the Non-Aligned Movement, noted that, 30 years since the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Development, it was more pressing than ever to allow for social progress and dignity for all people. Without the realization of the right to development, it was impossible to achieve other human rights. Some countries had blocked progress in this area, such as through unilateral coercive measures and foreign intervention. Countries should build regional integration on the basis of solidarity and the empowerment of women. It supported the need for a legally binding instrument on the right to development, and regretted the lack of political will and positions that had blocked the work of the Working Group in the past.

18. Cuba observed that there was still work to be done to achieve the right to development as a universal human right of individuals and peoples. Unfair trade and the economic crises were some of the obstacles to the right to development. They eroded the lives of millions of people who continued to live in poverty. Cuba rejected the efforts made to limit the scope and definition of the right to development, and assured its commitment to the Working Group and its willingness to work with all delegations to achieve results.

19. Indonesia, aligning itself with the statement of the Non-Aligned Movement, stated that the realization of the right to development was more pertinent than ever. The right to development had to be mainstreamed in the framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It looked forward to progress on the criteria and sub-criteria. It also hoped for a non-politicized discussion, and that the right to development was recognized as a right.

20. Ecuador, aligning itself with the statement made by the Non-Aligned Movement, stated that the international community needed a legal framework agreed at the international level to move forward in the implementation of the right to development. The concept of "living well" had been incorporated into the Constitution Ecuador, which implied the inclusion of all persons and groups, social justice and other considerations. Ecuador hoped that the Working Group could move towards the approval of the criteria.

21. The United States of America was determined to have a constructive discussion. It maintained its position that there was a need for greater consensus on the definition of the right to development that was consistent with human rights, namely, universal rights that were held and enjoyed by individuals and that each individual may demand from his or her own Government. It emphasized the importance of indicators in any conversation on the right to development, and expressed the hope that Member States would respect its concerns about efforts to push too quickly in the Working Group, but rather seek to build consensus in a step-by-step fashion.

22. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) regarded human rights as intrinsic to development, and development as a means to realize human rights. This approach was at the centre of its Strategic Plan. UNDP reaffirmed the principles of national ownership and capacity-building. It identified six fundamental areas of action: (a) expanding knowledge and communication; (b) strong national ownership and leadership; (c) generating and sharing new ideas, knowledge and technologies; (d) broad and active coalitions; (e) enabling resources; and (f) robust follow-up and review, including timely disaggregated data. UNDP promoted a "MAPS" approach: mainstreaming, acceleration and policy support.

23. Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, speaking on behalf of the working group on the right to development of the Geneva Forum of Catholic-Inspired Non-Governmental Organizations,[2] expressed its satisfaction that the Human Rights Council had decided at its thirty-first session to hold a panel discussion on the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development at its thirty-second session, although it regretted the abstentions. It was pleased with the decision of the Working Group to continue the second reading of the criteria and sub-criteria, and hoped that it would not be affected by the political polarization of previous sessions. It emphasized that the Declaration was an empowering instrument, and that it was imperative to achieve the right to development for the sake of the disadvantaged.

24. International-Lawyers.Org stated that the right to development had been central to the United Nations since the adoption of the Declaration. However, inequitable relations remained at the international and national levels. While efforts to achieve the right were far from a success, it forward to the one-day high-level segment to be held by the General Assembly, and hoped for strong civil society participation.

B. Informal consultations by the Chair-Rapporteur

25. The Chair-Rapporteur informed the Working Group on the informal consultations he had held between the annual sessions with regional and political groups and other stakeholders.

26. In October 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur presented his report to the Third Committee of the General Assembly and had an interactive discussion with the Committee members. He held a number of meetings with regional and political groups, heads of delegations and representatives of various United Nations departments and agencies, and civil society

[2] Statement made on behalf of Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, Association Points-Coeur, Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), the Company of the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers), the International Institute of Mary Our Help of the Salesian Sisters of Don Bosco (IIMA), the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, MIAMSI, New Humanity, the Teresian Association and VIDES International (International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education, Development).

organizations. In the meetings, the Chair-Rapporteur referred to his report requested by the Working Group (A/HRC/WG.2/17/2) and clarified that he was looking for common ground and did not intend to draft a document that would fuel controversy. Importantly, the Sustainable Development Goals, which were adopted by the General Assembly by consensus during the United Nations summit, set down key principles relating to the right to development, and should therefore guide the content of the proposed draft standards.

27. In February 2016, the Chair-Rapporteur spoke at an event marking the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development, co-organized by OHCHR, entitled "In search of dignity and sustainable development for all". At the thirty-first session of the Human Rights Council, he took the floor during the panel discussion on human rights mainstreaming, which focused on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and human rights, with an emphasis on the right to development. He also spoke at a high-level side event organized by the African Group on the right to development. In his statements, the Chair-Rapporteur emphasized that the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals had been a major step towards the realization of the right to development. Lastly, he also conducted informal consultations with the coordinators of the regional and political groups and other interested delegations on the draft programme of work of the seventeenth session of the Working Group.

C. Report of the High Commissioner on the realization and implementation of the right to development

28. The Chief of the Right to Development Section of the Office of the High Commissioner introduced the report of the High Commissioner on the realization and implementation of the right to development (A/HRC/WG.2/17/3). The report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 30/28, in which the Council endorsed the recommendation of the Working Group adopted at its sixteenth session and requested the High Commissioner to seek the views of Member States in preparing a paper on the realization and implementation of the right to development, as elaborated in the Declaration on the Right to Development, in particular its article 4.

29. In the ensuing discussion, the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, expressed its disappointment with the report prepared by OHCHR, given that it merely summarized the views of Member States, and did not meet its expectation of a substantive analysis of the right to development. It would have preferred that the report answer the following questions:

(a) What steps are required for the realization and implementation of the right to development?

(b) How can international law in general, and human rights instruments, including in particular the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, contribute to the realization of the right to development, in particular through friendly relations and cooperation among States?

(c) International cooperation is an integral element for the realization of the right to development; what are the concrete measures taken by OHCHR to promote international cooperation in the field of the right to development?

(d) How can the international community, in particular developed countries, help developing countries to foster their comprehensive development policies?

(e) What has the United Nations system and OHCHR done to ensure the full exercise and progressive enhancement of the right to development at the international level?

30. Namibia aligned itself with the views of the Non-Aligned Movement and thanked OHCHR for the report, which reflected the feedback provided by the inputs. The outcome was not anticipated, as there was a difference between what the report presented and what the resolution requested. An analytical paper was expected, given that the submissions of States was supposed to be only a component to inform the report. Mexico welcomed the report, and thanked the secretariat for its support. The report had provided valuable elements, like the successes and challenges that States had faced to ensure the right to development and the impact of the right to development on national human rights policies. In recent years, Mexico had redesigned its social policy development to incorporate the respect and promotion of human rights as one of its top priorities. This practice had increased accessibility, capacity and the reach of development programmes. However, important challenges remained in terms of institutional, budgetary and technical coordination, and there was a need for specialized monitoring mechanisms.

31. The Chief of the Right to Development Section thanked the delegates for their comments. He explained that the recommendation made by the Working Group had been interpreted as a request for a report compiling the views of States. Furthermore, the breadth of the subject matter would have made it very difficult to address the subject matter comprehensively within the word limit for the report. He added that the Working Group might wish to clarify its expectations in the recommendations of the current session. The Office remained fully committed to implementing its recommendations.

D. Interactive dialogue on the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda in the context of the right to development

32. On the second day of the session, the Working Group held an interactive dialogue on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in the context of the right to development with the former co-facilitators for the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda: the Permanent Representative of Ireland to United Nations Headquarters, Ambassador David Donoghue, and the Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations Headquarters, Ambassador Macharia Kamau.

33. Ambassador Donoghue stressed that the right to development had found its rightful place in the 2030 Agenda, and that it provided a new context to look at the right to development. The right to development was given a reasonably prominent position in two specific references, which reflected the significant respect for the right to development; a number of references in the document moreover recalled the Declaration; in some pledges the preamble, that no one would be left behind; this made clear that inequality within and among countries had to be addressed. The 2030 Agenda could be viewed as a landmark document for achieving the right to development. The agenda dealt with the factors impeding the realization of human rights, showing the clear connection between human rights and development. There was also emphasis on Goal 17, which outlined a set of commitments and the means of implementation. The Agenda called for action at the global, regional and national levels with a governmental rather than sectoral approach. Global indicators had been agreed upon at a technical level, but the issue of data collection and capacity were particularly important, given that many Governments did not have sufficient statistical capacity. This issue would be discussed at the high-level political forum on sustainable development in July 2016. Although the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was not legally binding, it was politically and morally binding. Implementation would be improved by mutual learning and the exchange of best practices on a voluntary basis. This would require political will, commitment and goodwill. The risk of political embarrassment was the main source of leverage: States would not want to be seen as underperforming, particularly at the regional level.

34. Ambassador Kamau spoke of how the Sustainable Development Goals and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development had changed the debate on development and how geographical divides had been put to rest. The Agenda had structurally changed the underpinnings of the way the international community looked at development. It was, however, difficult to change people's ideological positions. The universal goals conveyed the message that development affected all nations, and poverty affected all countries, which now faced the challenge of bringing development to all their peoples. Twentieth-century perceptions of development were old and tired. The Sustainable Development Goals emphasized that all lives mattered, and this was the most powerful message they sent. The Working Group should not let itself become stuck in a North-South divide in the conceptualization of the right to development. The 2030 Agenda was morally binding; he therefore asked whether a legal or a moral obligation was more important. All countries were in "the same boat" and faced similar challenges. The 2030 Agenda had resulted in a conceptual framework shift; the Working Group therefore had to ask if it was shifting with it. One challenge to the implementation of the right to development was what the meaning of development assistance as "legally binding" was. This would require defining the understanding of development cooperation. The moral obligation was the higher bar. Goal 17 and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda had codified expectations in a way that could be followed up. In these ways, the work of the Working Group had been structured, and many aspects of the right to development were already legally binding. There was a universal, integrated agenda and a political infrastructure in place that provided a much more favourable position for discussions on the right to development.

35. In the interactive dialogue that followed, the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, referred to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as a document that reflected the aspirations of global development, and expressed the hope that the full implementation of the Agenda would move the world forward towards the realization of the Charter of the United Nations. The goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda were all about the right to development, and called for international cooperation and collaborative partnership. International cooperation was integral to the implementation and realization of the right to development, and could help all to overcome the challenges that hinder progress. The Islamic Republic of Iran called upon the specialized agencies, funds and programmes of the United Nations to mainstream the right to development in their policies and operational activities, and also in policies and strategies of the international financial and multilateral trading system. The high-level political forum was the most appropriate venue for considering the mainstreaming of the right to development into the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

36. The European Union spoke of the 2030 Agenda as a "guiding beacon" for the international community. It stressed the need to maintain momentum, and that the realization of human rights and sustainable development were closely related. The international community needed to promote a model of development that promoted and guaranteed not only the right to development but all human rights, with particular attention to justice, equality and equity, so that no one would be left behind. The European Union supported an inclusive and transparent follow-up mechanism of the 2030 Agenda that promoted ownership. The European Union asked the speakers how the international community could implement the 2030 Agenda effectively and without delay, and how they saw the role of indicators in implementation.

37. Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, stated that there were clearly a few key areas where the 2030 Agenda and the right to development interacted. The 2030 Agenda explicitly mentioned the right to development as an instrument that informed the Agenda itself; it called upon Member States to realize the right to development. Article 10 of the Vienna Declaration and the Programme of Action called upon the international community to implement effective international cooperation for the

right to development. In its paragraph 63, 2030 Agenda referred to "policy space" and "national development efforts", and the enabling environment, which would be a challenge. Examples were given of the Doha Development Round, of policy coordination and coherence, and of conflicts and occupations that were all obstacles hampering the implementation of the Agenda. Pakistan also referred to the "cherry picking" of obligations and targets, and questioned how far a moral obligation would take the international community.

38. Tunisia, aligning itself with the views of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, expressed doubts on the practicalities of the conceptual framework change, which it did not view as profound. Member States had differing approaches to the economy, and while partnership for development was required for an enabling environment, development assistance and the current economic and financial frameworks would hinder the achievement of goals in developing countries. Cuba, supporting the views of the Non-Aligned Movement and endorsing the statement made by the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, reiterated the view that obstacles persisted. It referred to how the Working Group had "put the cart before the horse" by debating the issue of indicators before agreeing on a larger agenda, and stressed that lessons could be learned from how this had been done in the 2030 Agenda. Cuba asked the speakers how they saw implementation going forward, and how the Working Group could contribute.

39. Namibia, aligning itself with the views of the Non-Aligned Movement, pointed out that international cooperation was indispensable for addressing obstacles that were beyond the capacity of national Governments. The focus should be on development, not benevolence, and there should be no "cherry picking". What was needed was not a moral obligation but a legally binding instrument to ensure that the right to development was implemented properly. South Africa, aligning itself with the statement made by the Non-Aligned Movement, spoke of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want, which also sought to address the triple challenge of poverty, unemployment and inequality. The most persistent accountability deficit had been witnessed in relation to the financial commitments to the global partnership for development envisaged previously under Goal 8. A strengthened and revitalized Global Partnership for Sustainable Development was thus crucial, and based on the principles of the Declaration on the Right to Development. There was a need for the inclusion of the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, which was highlighted by many delegations. It also referred to the role of the private sector and business, and the need for their accountability in relation to human rights and humanitarian violations.

40. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland shared the views that the Sustainable Development Goals were universal, that human rights were the cornerstone for achieving them, and that national development plans incorporating a "whole of Government" approach were required, together with partnerships to engage in best practices to coordinate and monitor implementation. The United Kingdom was fulfilling its commitments through development assistance, boosting partnerships and cross-government funds. It referred to the need for global transparency standards, the "golden thread" of which were democracy, the rule of law, property rights, a free media and open, accountable institutions. The United States of America discussed its long-standing commitment to human rights and development, and how human rights were integrated into its development cooperation. It pointed out the importance of indicators and data-driven analysis.

41. China reiterated the view that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was a landmark in sustainable development, and mentioned the importance of poverty eradication. It also referred to the need to tackle environmental challenges, to promote social justice and to ensure better and sustainable development. At the international level, partnerships and coordination were essential. China spoke of its own national commitments

and promotion of financial support and capacity-building. Japan strongly supported the 2030 Agenda and its human-centred approach, but had questions relating to indicators and the role of private sector investment. Brazil discussed how the 2030 Agenda had reinvigorated multilateralism, and reaffirmed the three dimensions of development as enshrined in the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development of 1992. The Agenda required the strengthening of international cooperation and the doubling of efforts on the right to development, to move away from polarization and to achieve consensus. Brazil enquired about the role of the Working Group in the Agenda. Kenya observed that the right to development did not always receive the support and attention it deserved by the Human Rights Council. Bearing in mind the time it would take to negotiate a legally binding instrument, given current challenges, Kenya asked what could be done to move the right to development agenda forward. Ecuador raised a question on how the fair distribution of wealth within countries could be measured.

42. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development pointed out its long-standing commitment to and participation in the sessions of the Working Group. Given the impetus provided by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, it was important that the Working Group find a concrete outcome and role within this framework, to also utilize valuable time and resources.

43. South Centre emphasized the need for common but differentiated responsibility. It referred to examples of intellectual property rights, transfer of technology and actions on climate change where it was not always clear who was responsible for what. Given differentiated capabilities, there was also a need for differentiated responsibilities. On measurability, there was also the question regarding both the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and human rights of whether all components could be measurable as such. According to Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the new Agenda had incorporated the transformative vision of the Declaration on the Right to Development. If adequately implemented, it would provide new impetus for the realization of the right to development. A right to development approach to the Sustainable Development Goals would create positive effects, including the understanding that States have duties to ensure development as a human right and not as a matter of charity. It referred to the need for participatory and inclusive monitoring. The global high-level political forum should build on the work of human rights mechanisms, while the Working Group should also take charge of the important role it could play. International-Lawyers.Org pointed out that the process of drafting the Sustainable Development Goals had begun by agreeing on issues of principle, not the specifics of indicators. It observed that human rights today were often legal rights. With regard to the 2030 Agenda, the greatest flaws were the tendency to make unequal things equal, and that not all States or all peoples had the same responsibilities.

44. In replying to the questions asked, Ambassador Kamau noted that the general trajectory was a positive one, despite war, conflict and other disasters. The right to development agenda had to move forward. The world had been moving on, irrespective of developments in the Working Group. The 2030 Agenda had to be addressed in an integrated fashion, and not by "cherry picking". Expectations had to be managed; the Sustainable Development Goals did not prescribe a particular political or economic model, but were aimed at reaching agreement on concrete goals and targets. The discussion could not have started with indicators, and that work had been delegated to a technical group. There was no need to "reinvent the wheel"; the Working Group should ask itself whether it really wanted to embark on an exercise of identifying indicators or leave it to a technical group. All forms of resource mobilization were important, including at the domestic level. Accountability deficits had to be closed. The common but differentiated responsibilities were part and parcel of the 2030 Agenda, so this had been settled. Many of the comments were acknowledged. Ambassador Kamau reiterated the need to search for the common good. In this regard, the 2030 Agenda had set a high bar, and there was enough ambition

and common ground to succeed. Implementation would be achieved at the national level and through commitments made in the framework of international instruments that would require monitoring. Ambassador Donoghue reiterated that it would not have been possible to finish the work on indicators in September 2015, and that it was to be concluded separately and the work done by a technical body. There would be no clustering of topics, given that implementation was only at its early stages. He endorsed the idea that the 2030 Agenda should be seen as an opportunity to reinvigorate the role of the Working Group, and that the positive energy of the Sustainable Development Goals should be used to find new ways forward.

E. Second reading to refine draft right to development criteria and corresponding operational sub-criteria

45. The Working Group completed the second reading of the draft right to development criteria and the corresponding operational sub-criteria listed in the report of the high-level task force (A/HRC/15/WG.2/TF/2/Add.2, annex) with the aim of refining them, starting from sub-criterion 1 (h) (ii) bis.

46. The Working Group decided to adopt the same methodology as followed previously, looking at the criteria and the sub-criteria simultaneously. Some speakers suggested that explanations and reasons be provided for the various proposals made, particularly if the concern was about the concept or the language used.

47. One criterion and 14 sub-criteria were agreed ad referendum.

48. Criteria 1 (h), (i) and (j) and corresponding sub-criteria were discussed at the session covering topics such as the sharing of benefits of natural resources and issues relating to conflict and peace and security. Discussions also covered the adoption and periodic review of development strategies at the national and international levels, including collection and access to data, plans of action, political and financial support, and consultation and participation. Criterion 2 (a) and corresponding sub-criteria relating to law, policy and legal frameworks and sustainable development and right to development were discussed. Criterion 2 (b) and corresponding sub-criteria, covering topics such as human rights instruments, obligations, right to development and national development strategies, were also discussed. The views expressed during consideration of criterion 2 (c) and corresponding sub-criteria concerned access to information, effective remedies, access to justice, facilitating participation, and non-discrimination. The Working Group, in examining criterion 2 (d) and its sub-criteria, expressed views on good governance, the rule of law, global governance and the effective participation of all countries in international decision-making. Discussions on criterion 2 (e) and its sub-criteria covered good governance and the rule of law at the national level, corruption, transparency, and access to public services. On criterion 3 (a) and its sub-criteria, discussions covered the benefits of sustainable development, including access to services, infrastructure gaps, the equitable sharing of the benefits of globalization and the removal of international obstacles. Discussions on criterion 3 (b) and its sub-criteria covered the fair sharing of the burdens of development, assessing environmental, social and economic risks, common but differentiated responsibilities, and international cooperation. The discussions held on criterion 3 (c) and its sub-criteria featured the promotion of social justice, the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger, policies for ensuring decent work, strengthening international cooperation, land and housing related rights, access to education, and eliminating violence and trafficking. A range of new proposals for sub-criteria were also discussed by the Working Group.

49. A broad range of perspectives emerged during the consideration of individual criteria and sub-criteria. A debate was held on the use of such terms as the "human rights of migrants", and on how to combine references to human rights and refugees law. In this regard, discussions were held on references to international mechanisms for conflict prevention, and on whether this was the appropriate forum to discuss them. On sub-criterion 1 (j), a discussion was held on international development strategies, which were clarified as a focus on international cooperation as opposed to national development strategies.

50. Other issues discussed concerned participation, participatory processes, affected groups and vulnerable populations, preventive solidarity, the promotion of human rights education, the contribution of human rights mechanisms for evaluating the right to development, and the Sustainable Development Goals.

51. References to binding legal frameworks on the right to development were debated, including concerns raised on the term "right to development-based approach", the ratification of human rights instruments, the term "good governance" as opposed to "global governance", "accountability for" versus "promotion of" respect by business, the context and meaning of transparency, how to deal with corruption, and utilizing such terms as "equity" and "equitable".

52. The issue of data collection capacity was also raised. It was found that some developing countries required assistance in this area.

F. Consideration of the report of the Chair-Rapporteur

53. The Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group introduced his report containing standards for the implementation of the right to development, prepared pursuant to a request of the Working Group as endorsed by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 30/28 (A/HRC/WG.2/17/2). The aim of the standards was to break the deadlock that had persisted in the Working Group and to identify common ground and agreed language. Since the right to development had to be people-centred, it could not be achieved or met without responding to human needs. The adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development would facilitate the task of the Working Group. National capacities and capabilities for realizing the right to development differed, and international cooperation was necessary. With regard to methodology, the Chair-Rapporteur identified the key challenges and obstacles to the implementation of the right to development, and focused on the implementation of universally accepted core development goals, such as those outlined in article 8 of the Declaration on the Right to Development. Of particular importance was Sustainable Development Goal 17, given that it related to the means of implementation and the revitalization of the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development.

54. The standards were intended as a road map or framework for action for achieving the Goals. They employed agreed language so as to ensure that they were non-controversial and enjoyed the broadest possible endorsement. The four standards proposed were as follows:

> **Standard 1**: All States shall demonstrate the necessary political will and commitment to realize the right to development on the basis of the obligations, rights and duties that they have accepted as a result of the decisions and resolutions adopted by consensus by the international community.
>
> **Standard 2**: All States shall cooperate to create the political, economic and social environment necessary to allow the implementation of the right to development.

Standard 3: The right to development shall be centred on the individual and promoted at the national level, which requires a comprehensive and inclusive approach based on good, responsible governance. Since there are different levels of development, however, national efforts must be strengthened and reinforced by regional cooperation, international assistance and contributions by development agencies at the national, regional and international levels, and also by inputs from civil society bodies and the media.

Standard 4: Priority should be given to addressing the most basic human needs, namely, poverty, food, water and sanitation, health, education, housing and gender equality.

55. With regard to monitoring the implementation of the above standards, the Chair-Rapporteur proposed a voluntary mechanism. States, regional and international organizations would submit reports on efforts made at the bilateral, regional and international levels to the Human Rights Council, for example, within the context of the universal periodic review. In the long term, quantitative criteria should be used to measure national and international efforts. The indicators for measuring the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals could facilitate measurement of the implementation of the right to development. He stressed that a selective or segmented approach should not be taken to human rights, which are interrelated and interdependent. The right to development addressed human needs, which were critical to the attainment of human rights. The standards were not an end in themselves, but rather the beginning of a journey towards the full implementation of the right to development, the "stepping stones" or a road map to the final destination.

56. During the discussion, the European Union stated that the document was timely, especially with a view to the recently adopted 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Although it supported the use of agreed language, it felt that it might be excessive to affirm that the 2030 Agenda constituted an impetus to the realization of the right to development and solved controversies about the right to development, given that divergences persisted. While the standards focused on international cooperation, national responsibilities had to be stressed. While the new international development goals were crucial for the realization of the right to development, the goals should not be implemented without reflecting on the links with already existing human rights standards on housing, education and gender equality, which are binding upon States parties. Legally binding human rights standards should not be reformulated with a view of finding consensus. On the core elements, the European Union argued that participation, equality, non-discrimination and self-determination should be singled out clearly as core standards or cross-cutting elements. Gender equality should be a cross-cutting issue also. Some questions were raised with regard to the reference to women and their nurturing role in the family, as this seemed to suggest that this was the sole activity of women, and to avoiding duplication with the Sustainable Development Goal monitoring process.

57. The Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, stated that the standards prepared by the Chair-Rapporteur underscored a right to development-based approach. The implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was dependent on an integrated, holistic and comprehensive approach to the implementation and realization of the right to development, which required a firm commitment by all actors. While giving significant impetus to the implementation of the right to development, the 20130 Agenda was not a substitute for discussion on the conceptual framework of the right to development, such as the elaboration of norms. The Non-Aligned Movement remained concerned about existing challenges and conceptual debates on the right to development. The report of the Chair-Rapporteur was based on a consensual and non-controversial understanding of the right to development. The Non-Aligned Movement

maintained that the consensus requirement was not an absolute one, and should not come at the expense of ensuring that the right to development was a reality for all. Regarding the standards, the Non-Aligned Movement was of the view that this initial discussion, together with the proposals made by Member States, would form the basis for the constitution of international standards and a convention on the right to development. International cooperation was an integral part to the implementation of the right to development. The right to development was distinct and should not be defined through secondary aspects of development. With regard to the methodology outlined by the Chair-Rapporteur, the Non-Aligned Movement would take the liberty to consider the text, make it its own and use it for whatever purpose it deemed fit.

58. Cuba stated that the report and conclusions had been prepared by the Chair-Rapporteur, and that it was not logical to negotiate his conclusions. It disagreed with the view that the standards were too focused on international cooperation, and in fact felt that they were too focused on the national level. Namibia, Egypt, South Africa, Tunisia and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela supported the statement delivered by the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Namibia commented that the conclusions of the Chair-Rapporteur were not an end in themselves, but rather the beginning of a new process, even though the procedural aspects of discussions on them still required clarification. Egypt referred to the critical timing of the report, stating that it was a foundation on which to develop the right conditions for the right to development to be realized. To ensure the political will required in standard 1, the document should refer to international cooperation, the transfer of technology and the means to achieve the right to development as an integrated approach covering social, economic and environmental development.

59. Brazil stated that the report of the Chair-Rapporteur, which contained loud and clear messages on the right to development, would aid the work of the Working Group. It agreed with the Chair-Rapporteur that the human right to development was no longer questioned, and that the document outlined a practical and realistic approach. With a collaborative and cooperative spirit, the Sustainable Development Goals would guide the Working Group in its work, giving the most significant impetus to the realization of the right to development. South Africa referred to the developments of recent years, when the issue of the criteria and sub-criteria had left the Working Group in disarray and had not been cost-effective. It supported the vision of the Chair-Rapporteur to put the Working Group on a more positive trajectory. The standards provided food for thought for work on a convention on the right to development. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that the report of the Chair-Rapporteur would render the mandate of the Working Group more effective by promoting reflection. It provided a road map to be debated, and mechanisms and tools to move forward.

60. Argentina thanked the Chair-Rapporteur for his report, and expressed its appreciation for the set of standards presented to the Working Group for its consideration. Engagement with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was a priority for the Government of Argentina. Development should be understood as "sustainable development". The 2030 Agenda renewed the commitment with an integral human development strategy, which included people and the environment, and was aimed at strengthening institutions, civil society and international cooperation.

61. Japan reiterated the view that there should be more balance between national responsibility and international cooperation; the report of the Chair-Rapporteur tended towards the latter. It requested more clarity with regard to the use of such terms as rights and obligations in the document. It concluded with a call to discuss the document in more detail and to reach consensus. Tunisia stressed the pressing need for a favourable environment for realizing the right to development. While this was connected to

Sustainable Development Goal 17, there were many elements in the 2030 Agenda that should be factored in. It referred to the trade system, the need for policy space, and the participation of countries in global governance, and gave examples relating to food and health, where a favourable international environment was lacking.

62. The United States of America commented on the characterization of the Sustainable Development Goals, given that they were aspirational and non-binding goals, not parallel to human rights. Wording that suggested legal obligations and binding commitments were therefore to be avoided. It also suggested that national efforts be highlighted and that more references be made to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reiterated its view on the need for national obligations to be stressed, and that reference be made also to Sustainable Development Goal 16. It raised broader questions on how the Goals would be referenced in the report of the Working Group on the current session, and whether the monitoring system would not duplicate those being considered for the Goals.

63. Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, speaking on behalf of the working group on the right to development of the Geneva Forum of Catholic-Inspired Non-Governmental Organizations,[1] agreed that on the need to set standards, which were crucial for responding to human basic needs and to render justice to rights that had been too long denied. It hoped that consensus could be reached on the proposed standards. International-Lawyers.Org viewed the standards as basic consensus on agreed text, and shared the view of the Chair-Rapporteur that there were uncontroversial. Centre Europe – Tiers Monde recalled that all aspects of the right to development were interdependent, and the risk of selectivity.

64. The Chair-Rapporteur responded that his report was the document that he had been mandated to prepare, with his views. Even though it was not intended as a document for negotiation or to generate consensus, the text itself was based on consensus documents. He was not reformulating legally binding standards. Core elements, such as participation, non-discrimination, equality and self-determination, could still be seen as contested. Characterizing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the right to development was an unnecessary area of controversy and debate. There was no imbalance towards international cooperation, given that both standards 1 and 3 were specifically worded to cover national responsibilities. On gender roles, the language had been taken from the Sustainable Development Goals. The logic of the proposal on monitoring was to outline a voluntary commitment, which implied no obligation or need for consensus. This would be pending agreement on the follow-up to the 2030 Agenda. While the Sustainable Development Goals were non-binding and aspirational only, States were expected to abide by their commitments. The Goals were therefore an important achievement.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

65. **At the final meeting of its seventeenth session, on 3 May 2016, the Working Group adopted, by consensus, its conclusions and recommendations, in accordance**

[1] Statement made on behalf of Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Association Points-Coeur, Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), the Company of the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers), the International Institute of Mary Our Help of the Salesian Sisters of Don Bosco (IIMA), the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, MIAMSI, New Humanity, the Teresian Association and VIDES International (International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education, Development).

with its mandate, as established by the Commission on Human Rights in its resolution 1998/72.

A. Conclusions

66. The Working Group expressed its appreciation to all those who had contributed to the proceedings of its seventeenth session.

67. The Working Group welcomed the presence and participation of the Deputy High Commissioner at the session, and had noted her opening remarks.

68. The Working Group welcomed the re-elected Chair-Rapporteur, and commended him for his able stewardship in guiding deliberations during the session.

69. The Working Group took note of the standards for the implementation of the right to development (A/HRC/WG.2/17/2), and expressed its gratitude and appreciation for the efforts made by the Chair-Rapporteur in its preparation, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 30/28. It considered the report a useful basis for further deliberations on the implementation and realization of the right to development.

70. The Working Group welcomed the conclusion of the second reading of the draft criteria and operational sub-criteria (A/HRC/15/WG.2/TF/2/Add.2).

71. The thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development in 2016 presented a unique opportunity for the international community, including the Working Group, to demonstrate and reiterate its political commitment and to accord the right to development the high profile it deserves, and to redouble its efforts to implement the right to development. In this regard, the Working Group welcomed the events that will be held on this occasion.

72. The Working Group took note of the paper submitted by the High Commissioner on the realization and implementation of the right to development, as elaborated in the Declaration on the Right to Development.

73. The Working Group took note with appreciation of the presence of the former co-facilitators for the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda, acknowledged that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was a landmark document, and looked forward to the possible engagement of the Working Group with the high-level political forum.

B. Recommendations

74. The Working Group recommended that:

(a) It continue to consider criteria and operational sub-criteria with a view to finalize the text as expeditiously as possible, preferably no later than its nineteenth session;

(b) OHCHR make available on its website and to the Working Group a conference room paper containing the draft right to development criteria and operational sub-criteria following its second reading, and the comments and views submitted at the sessions by Governments, groups of Governments, regional groups, and stakeholders, respectively;

(c) OHCHR take sufficient measures to ensure balanced and visible allocation of resources, and pay due attention to the visibility and effective

implementation and mainstreaming of the right to development by systematically identifying and undertaking tangible projects dedicated to the right, and that it continue to update the Council and the Working Group on progress in that regard;

(d) The Working Group, in its future deliberations, study the contributions made by States at the national, regional and international levels to the implementation of the right to development, in keeping with mechanisms relating to the Sustainable Development Goals;

(e) The High Commissioner include in his next annual report an analysis on the realization and implementation of the right to development, taking into account existing challenges and making recommendations on overcoming them;

(f) The OHCHR consider facilitating the participation of experts in the eighteenth session of the Working Group, to provide advice with a view to contribute to discussions on the implementation and realization of the right to development, and on the implications of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;

(g) The Working Group consider further the set of standards conducive to the implementation and realization of the right to development.

Annex

List of attendance

States Members of the Human Rights Council

Algeria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

States Members of the United Nations

Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, United States of America, Uruguay, Zimbabwe.

Non-Member States represented by an observer

Holy See.

United Nations agencies, funds and programmes

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Intergovernmental organizations

European Union, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, International Development Law Organization, South Centre.

Non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council

General

Centre Europe – Tiers Monde (CETIM), New Humanity.

Special

Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Association Points-Coeur, Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, International-Lawyers.Org, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme (RADDHO), Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie.